



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/821,109	03/29/2001	James I. Knutson	AUS920010194US1	3270
7590	03/24/2004			EXAMINER
Frank C. Nicholas				MOSLEHI, FARHOOD
CARDINAL LAW GROUP				
Suite 2000				
1603 Orrington Avenue				
Evanston, IL 60201				
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2154	5
			DATE MAILED: 03/24/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/821,109	KNUTSON ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Farhood Moslehi	2154

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 January 2004.

2a) This action is **FINAL**.                            2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

4) Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-21 are presented for examination.
2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

3. Claims 1-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Bowman-Amuah (US 6,332,163) (hereinafter Bowman).
4. As per claim 1, Bowman describes a method of interfacing to pre-existing software code, comprising:

Providing a software wrapper capable of inheriting from at least a first application program interface (API) and a second API (e.g. col. 219, lines 19-42); Delegating to a pre-existing enumeration of objects for a call to the first API (e.g. col. 222, lines 20-40), The Legacy Wrapper Component and the Component Adapter provides the same functionality of a function call to the first object via its API;

Creating a vector identifying elements of the enumeration (e.g. col. 206, lines 25-45);  
Maintaining a positional cursor based on a call to the second API (e.g. col. 222, lines 1-22);

Comparing the positional cursor to the vector; (e.g. col. 206, lines 5-60); and selectively extracting one or more additional elements from the enumeration based on the comparison of the positional cursor and the vector (e.g. col. 206, lines 5-60).

5. As per claim 8, it is rejected for the similar reasons as stated above.
6. As per claim 15, it is rejected for the similar reasons as stated above.
7. As per claim 2, Bowman describes the method wherein the first API is a java-based enumeration API (e.g. col. 206, line 47).
8. As per claim 10, it is rejected for the similar reason as stated above.
9. As per claim 16, it is rejected for the similar reason as stated above.
10. As per claim 17, it is rejected for the similar reason as stated above.
11. As per claim 3, Bowman describes the method wherein the second API is a java-based collection API (e.g. col. 206, line 29).
12. As per claim 11, it is rejected for the similar reason as stated above.
13. As per claim 18, it is rejected for the similar reason as stated above.
14. As per claim 4, Bowman describes the method further comprising: providing an iterator, associated with the second API, for maintaining the positional cursor (e.g. col. 206, lines 5-11).
15. As per claim 5, it is rejected for the similar reason as stated above.
16. As per claim 12, it is rejected for the similar reason as stated above.

17. As per claim 13, it is rejected for the similar reason as stated above.
18. As per claim 19, it is rejected for the similar reason as stated above.
19. As per claim 20, it is rejected for the similar reasons as stated above.
20. As per claim 6, Bowman describes a method further comprising:

Synchronizing a plurality of methods for extracting the elements from the enumeration (e.g. col. 206, lines 51-58).

21. As per claim 14, it is rejected for the similar reason as stated above.
22. As per claim 21, it is rejected for the similar reasons as stated above.
23. As per claim 7, Bowman describes a method wherein the step of selectively extracting includes:

Extracting the elements from the enumeration when the positional cursor matches the size of the vector (e.g. col. 206, lines 55-57).

As per claim 9, Bowman shows the system further comprising software code for defining the enumeration (e.g. col. 206, lines 47-49).

24. Applicant's arguments filed 1/22/2004 have been fully considered but are not persuasive.
25. In the remarks, applicants argued in substance that (1) Clearly, during an implementation of this control, Bowman-Amuah fails to teach or suggest the Legacy Adapter being capable of inheriting from more than one API, such as, for example, a first API and a second API, maintaining a positional cursor based on a call to a second API, comparing the positional cursor to a vector and selectively extracting one or more

additional elements from the enumeration based on the comparison of the positional cursor and the vector.

26. As to point (1), Bowman-Amuah implements multiple inheritance when discussing filters in his system (e.g. col. 199-200, lines 47-10 respectively). Furthermore, Figure 124 clearly illustrates multiple interfaces to an application including a handheld device, a PC and a telecommunications device.

***Conclusion***

27. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Farhood Moslehi whose telephone number is 703-305-8646. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on 703-305-8498. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

fm



JOHN FOLLANSBEE  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100